

Monographic Journals of the Near East
General Editor: Giorgio Buccellati

Afroasiatic Linguistics

Editor:
Robert Hetzron, Santa Barbara

Advisory Board:
Arne Ambros, Los Angeles
Ariel Bloch, Berkeley
John B. Callender, Los Angeles
Talmy Givón, Los Angeles
Thomas G. Penchoen, Los Angeles
Stanislav Segert, Los Angeles

1/2 (1974) 1—10

The Development of the Anomalous
Syriac Verb *eškāḥ* 'To Find':
A Case of Convergent Factors in
Linguistic Change

by
Joseph L. Malone



© 1974 by Undena Publications, P.O. Box 97, Malibu, California 90265

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photo-copy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 74-75190

ISBN: 0-89003-001-4

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ANOMALOUS SYRIAC VERB *eškāh* 'TO FIND':

A CASE OF CONVERGENT FACTORS IN LINGUISTIC CHANGE

by

Joseph L. Malone
Barnard College and Columbia University

The canonically anomalous shape of the Syriac verb *eškāh* 'to find' is shown to result from a convergence of diachronic pressures on an intersection of phonological weak spots and morphosyntactic imbalance. The effect of the changes is a trade-off of morphosyntactic defectiveness for moderate phonological anomaly. The developmental hypothesis adopted underscores the importance both of multiple factors in diachronic change and of homeostasis in linguistic systems.

1. Over a stretch of centuries roughly bisected by the start of the Christian Era, the North-western Semitic languages (including Aramaic, and hence also Syriac) were affected by a sound change labeled by Semitists attenuation (*Verdünnung*), whereby pretonic short *a > i (> e in Eastern Aramaic, including Syriac).¹ Though there is substantial evidence for attenuation in all NW languages whose orthographies allow of pertinent phonological interpretation, the domain of the change differed not only from language to language but also from dialect to dialect.² Moreover, attenuation was in every language severely restricted pursuant to morphological environment (again not identically from dialect to dialect),³ whether as an original condition on the change, or due to subsequent analogical retrenchments or eclectic borrowing of the results of the original change.

¹ For general discussion of attenuation, cf. Brockelmann (1961:I, 146f). The limits of the chronology remain to be ascertained in a clear way; cf. the partially discrepant views of Bauer and Leander (1962a:§14x) vs. Bergsträsser (1962:I, §26c), and the possible key to the discrepancy suggested by Malone (1972:433b). For *i > e in EAram., cf. Malone (1971:§2.2.8 with note 34). Abbreviations in language names are Arab(ic), Aram(aic), Bab(ylonian), Bib(lical), C(hristian), E(astern), J(ewish), Mand(aic), Pal(estinian), Syr(iac), Talm(udic), and W(estern).

² E.g. Tiberian Hebrew favors attenuation more than Babylonian Hebrew (Bauer and Leander 1962a:§14y). For a tabular synopsis of attenuation in some other Hebrew dialects as compared with Tiberian, cf. Malone (1972:433).

³ Hebrew examples are listed in Malone (1972:433). Interlinguistically, contrast the attenuated

A factor favoring attenuation, at least for Syriac, was an immediately following sibilant, perhaps especially the palatal š (regressive assimilation): e.g. *tašmištā > *tišmištā > teš-meštā 'service'.¹ Contrariwise, the causative-prefixal vowel a, though meeting the phonetic conditions for attenuation, was pervasively exempt from this change in Aramaic,² even in the optimal environment / š; e.g. Syr. ašlāh (≠ ēšlāh)³ 'to lay bare', ašmāṭ (≠ ēšmāṭ) 'to announce'.

The only clearly attested instance in Syriac of attenuation of causative a is the verb eškāh 'to find'.⁴ It will be the main goal of this paper to provide a rationale for this seemingly anomalous development.

2. To appreciate the evolution of eškāh here proposed, it will be necessary to view the phonology and morphosyntax of this verb against those of related Syriac forms, notably but not exclusively other verb forms. Note firstly Table 1, which exemplifies a cross-section of the typical Syriac strong verb. With regard to morphosyntactic oppositions, note the intersection of two parameters: causativity (left vs. right quadrants) and passivity (top vs. bottom quadrants).⁵ Illustrative semantic oppositions of a relatively transparent nature are suggested by the English glosses beneath the paradigms (e.g. simple-primary [qal] nešlām 'to be completed' vs. simple-causative [afel] našlēm 'to complete' [analytically 'to cause to be completed']); lacunae bespeak non-attestation, syntactic-semantic skewage, or specialization (idiomaticity).⁶ With regard to morphophonologic oppositions, note (i) the formal processes signalling the oppositions: prefixation (e.g. impf. n-, inf. m-, causative a-), suffixation (non-qal inf. -ū), and internal flexion (lexical roots [here √mlk and √slm] interdigitated with grammatical vowel schemes [e.g. qal apar. ā . . . e, ethpeel impa. a . . . ō]);⁷ (ii) the

Hebrew causative prefix hi- with its non-attenuated Common Aramaic cognate *ha- (~ *ʔa- > Syr. a-; cf. below).

¹Brockelmann (1965:§58).

²However, possible cases of sporadic attenuation of the causative prefix are attested in several Aram. languages: cf. e.g. the orthographic forms C.Pal. ⟨ykrz⟩ 'er verkündet' (Schulthess 1965:63), Pal. Talm. ⟨myšgh⟩ 'geruhend' (Dalman 1960:286), Bab. Talm. ⟨ʔypsyq⟩ 'er unterbrach' (Margolis 1910:46), Mand. ⟨ʔpra⟩ 'it increased' (Drower and Macuch 1963: s.v. PRA 1). All such cases should of course be taken with a grain of salt; at least some are doubtless errors or susceptible of some other explanation (e.g. Mand. ⟨ʔpra⟩ is likely to be a prothesized qal; cf. §2 below).

³Since the asterisk (*) will be reserved to mark diachronically reconstructed forms, the section mark (§) is used to mark synchronically non-occurrent forms. Cf. Malone (1970:210 note 2).

⁴Nöldeke (1904:§183).

⁵Omitted from this study is the parameter of intensity-factivity, involving the paradigms traditionally called pael (simple) and ethpaal (passive).

⁶It must be stressed that the degree of transparency illustrated by the examples of Table 1 is not meant to be proportionally representative of the typical Syriac verb. Indeed, skewage and specialization are extremely common, witnessing the largely derivational (lexical) nature of this sort of verb opposition (that of the so-called binyans) within Syriac, in fact within the Semitic languages in general. For a brief survey of Semitic binyans, cf. Moscati et. al. (1964:122-131).

⁷Morphophonemic processes not germane to the discussion include postvocalic spirantalization (e.g. neθmēlēx but eθmālk) and reflexive t + sibilant metathesis (e.g. neštēlēm but neθmēlēx). Note also the abbreviations impf. = imperfective, impa. = imperative, pf. = perfective, ppar. = passive participle, apar. = active participle, inf. = infinitive.

restriction of the residual opposition dynamic:neuter to the finite qal verb (specifically here, 2nd schematic o vs. a in the impf./impa., 2nd schematic a vs. e in the pf.).¹

Table 1

		PRIMARY		CAUSATIVE	
		qal (peal)		afel	
		(dynamic)	(neuter)		
S I M P L E	impf.	n e m l ó x	n e š l á m	n a m l é x	n a š l é m, etc.
	impa.	m e l ó x	š e l á m	} a m l é x	
	pf.	m e l á x	š e l é m		
	ppar.	m e l í x	š e l í m	m a m l á x	
	apar.	m â l é x	š a l é m	m a m l é x	
	inf.	m e m l á x	m e š l á m	m a m l â x ú	
		(1) 'to be king'	(3) 'to be completed'	(1) 'to make king'	(3) 'to complete'
		(2) 'to promise'	(4) 'to surrender'		(5) 'to transmit'
		ethpeel		ettafal	
P A S S I V E	impf.	n e θ m e l é x	n e š t e l é m, etc.	n e t t a m l á x	n e t t a š l á m, etc.
	impa.	e θ m á l k		} e t t a m l á x	
	pf.	e θ m e l é x			
	par.	m e θ m e l é x		m e t t a m l á x	
	inf.	m e θ m e l â x ú		m e t t a m l â x ú	
		(1) 'to be promised'	(4) 'to be surrendered'	(1) 'to be made king'	(5) 'to be transmitted'

¹I have chosen the terms dynamic:neuter rather than the entirely inappropriate transitive:intransitive (Nöldeke 1904:105f, Bauer and Leander 1962a:289, Wright 1967:30) or the misleading active:neuter (Duval 1881:176f, Brockelmann 1961:I, 505-508, Bergsträsser (1962, II, 74-77)). The latter pair of terms are susceptible of ambiguity in sharing one designation with the active:passive opposition, while transitive:intransitive are conventionally preempted for an entirely independent opposition. This latter point is best illustrated by a language where the dynamic:neuter distinction has not faded, like Classical Arabic; note e.g. dynamic-intransitive *šahaba* 'to go away', neuter-transitive *samiʿa* 'to hear'; other examples for Arabic in Wright (loc. cit.). A rather good characterization of the nature of the dynamic:neuter opposition is given by Brockelmann (1061:I500). It seems to me that a promising explication of this notion might be forthcoming in terms of the transformational framework outlined by Fillmore (1968), specifically in that dynamic verbs may be those whose surface subject derives from a deep noun phrase in the Agentive case, i.e. 'the case of the typically animate perceived instigator of the action identified by the verb' (24). It is not clear to me what Fillmorean subject-case correlations might be revealed by neuter verbs, though the most likely candidates seem to be Dative ('the case of the animate being affected by the state or action identified by the verb' (24)) and/or Objective ('conceivably . . . limited to things which are affected by the action or state identified by the verb . . . not to be

Table 2 exemplifies a cross-section of the typical 3/H verb., i.e. verbs whose third radical is a guttural (h, ḥ, ʕ) or r (traditional *tertiaie gutturalis* verbs). Of particular relevance here is the regressive-assimilatory neutralization to a of the 2nd schematic, unconditionally in the case of e and tendentially in the case of o.¹ Note that this assimilation leads to the categorical neutralization of some oppositions (impa.:pf. in the neuter qal, ppar.:apar. in the afel) and to the partial neutralization of others (dynamic:neuter, impa.:pf. in the dynamic qal).²

Table 2

		PRIMARY		CAUSATIVE	
		qal		afel	
		(dynamic)	(neuter)		
S	impf.	nešlô/ <u>á</u> ḥ	nešmáʕ	našl <u>á</u> ḥ	našm <u>á</u> ʕ, etc.
I	impa.	šelô/ <u>á</u> ḥ			
M			} šem <u>á</u> ʕ	} ašl <u>á</u> ḥ	
P	pf.	šel <u>á</u> ḥ			
L	ppar.	šel <u>í</u> ḥ	šem <u>í</u> ʕ		
E	apar.	š <u>á</u> l <u>á</u> ḥ	š <u>â</u> m <u>á</u> ʕ	} mašl <u>á</u> ḥ	
	inf.	mešl <u>á</u> ḥ	mešm <u>á</u> ʕ	mašl <u>â</u> ḥ <u>ú</u>	
		(1) 'to bare oneself'	(3) 'to hear'	(1) 'to lay bare'	(3) 'to announce'
		(2) 'to send'			
		ethpeel		ettafal	
P	impf.	nešt <u>ê</u> l <u>á</u> ḥ	nešt <u>em</u> <u>á</u> ʕ, etc.	nettašl <u>á</u> ḥ	nettaḥs <u>á</u> r, etc.
A	impa.	ešt <u>á</u> lḥ			
S	pf.	ešt <u>ê</u> l <u>á</u> ḥ		} ettašl <u>á</u> ḥ	
I	par.	mešt <u>ê</u> l <u>á</u> ḥ		mettašl <u>á</u> ḥ	
V					
E	inf.	mešt <u>ê</u> l <u>â</u> ḥ <u>ú</u>		mettašl <u>â</u> ḥ <u>ú</u>	
		(2) 'to be sent'	(3) 'to be heard'	(2) 'to be sent'	(4) 'to be fined'

confused with the notion of direct object . . ." (25)). To be sure, this hypothesis of mine can only be corroborated or put to rest by in-depth morphosyntactic studies of individual Semitic languages.

¹ Brockelmann (1965:36, 86f), Nöldeke (1904:39, 111f). For metathesis in the ethpeel (neštêláḥ etc.), cf. note 10. For the apparent semantic neutralization of the ethpeel: ettafal opposition in √šlh, cf. page 2, note 6.

² Just because of these neutralizations, the synchronic identification of 3/H verbs along some of these parameters requires perspicacity. E.g. with reference to the dynamic:neuters of Table 2, nešláḥ can be morphophonologically classified as a dynamic verb (at least in gloss (1), 'to bare oneself') since the impf. and impa. alternants nešlôḥ, šelôḥ are impossible for neuter verbs. On the other hand, the synchronic classification of nešmáʕ as neuter is not possible on a solely morphophonologic basis. In either case, of course, the syntactic-semantic criteria suggested in note 11 could be called upon to whatever degree the dynamic:neuter opposition still maintained sway in non-neutralized verbs. This issue needn't be

Table 3 lists a cross-section of the qal paradigm for the high-frequency verb 'to drink'. This verb belongs to the gizra (morphophonemic class) traditionally called *tertia infirmæ*, whose members show diphthongs or long vowels corresponding to 2nd shematic + 3rd radical in the strong verb (e.g. *neštē* vis-à-vis *nemlōx*, *eštāy* vis-à-vis *mēlōx*).¹ But what is of importance here is the fact that this verb evidences prothesis, eCC- in lieu of expected CəC- (thus *eštāy* vis-à-vis strong *mēlōx*, *eštī* vis-à-vis *mēlāx*). While this is the only prothetic verb clearly attested for Syriac, the prothetic process itself was by no means extraneous to other areas of the language's morphology, and was particularly common preceding sibilant + stop clusters.²

Table 3

	qal
impf.	<i>neštē</i>
impa.	<i>eštāy</i>
pf.	<i>eštī</i>
ppar.	(<i>eštē?</i>)
apar.	<i>šāθē</i>
inf.	<i>meštā</i>
	'to drink'

3. With the patterns of Tables 1-3 in mind, the corresponding morphology of eškāh may be considered in Table 4. With regard to morphophonology, note that (i) eškāh is a typical 3/H verb in respect of its 2nd shematic a in the afel and ethpeel; cf. Table 2 and contrast Table 1 (*neškāh* like *našlāh* unlike *namlēx* etc.); (ii) the qal ppar. *šəxīh* shows a prothetic alternant eškīh (cf. Table 3, and note that šk instantiates the optimal sibilant + stop);³ (iii) as was discussed in §1, eškāh is the only attested Syriac verb to undergo attenuation, and though only the afel is affected the change there is pervasive, effectively replacing the causative prefix a- by e-.⁴

decided in the present paper, as will become clear in §6(ii), and it is adequate for the task at hand to list *nešmā* as a neuter verb on the basis of its cognates (e.g. Heb. pf. *sōmēa* impf. *yišmā*; Arab. *sami'a*, *yasma'u*).

¹ Brockelmann (1965:§182), Nöldeke (1904:§176).

² Brockelmann (1965:§64), Nöldeke (1904:§51). In Table 3 the expected ppar. form *eštē* does not seem to be attested, but this may be just an accidental lacuna in extant Syriac MSS.

³ The diachronic (and synchronic [morphophonemic]) picture is not fully clear in all respects concerning alternations like *šəxīh* ~ *eškīh*, notably on whether (i) prothesis and hence the loss of ə (or of its antecedent *a) preceded spirantalization (cf. page 2, note 7) thus preserving the stop following š in *eškīh*, or (ii) spirantalization preceded prothesis and *šx later despirantalized to šk. (ii) is more likely than (i), but the overall fabric of considerations is slippery and discussion would take us too far afield. For some relevant points, cf. Malone (1971:§2.2.4 and 2.2.9; and notes 19, 36-39, 46 *ibid.*). For the št metathesis in the ethpeel, cf. page 2, note 7).

⁴ The chronological order of the three changes implied by the morphophonologic points just discussed is not important in this paper. In fact, for simplicity's sake a few other irrelevant

Table 4

		PRIMARY		CAUSATIVE	
		qal		afel	
S I M P L E	impf.	—		neškáh	< *naškéh
	impa.	—			
	pf.	—		eškáh	< *aškéh
	ppar.	šəxíh ~ eškíh	< *šəxíh	—	
		'found'			
	apar.	—		meškáh	< *maškéh
	inf.	—		meškâhú	< *maškâhú
				'to find'	
		ethpeel		ettafal	
P	impf.	neštəxáh	< *neštəxéh		
A	impa.	eštáxh	< *eštáxh		
S	pf.	eštəxáh	< *eštəxéh		
I	par.	meštəxáh	< *meštəxéh		
V				—	
E	inf.	meštəxâhú	< *meštəxâhú		
		'to be found'			

4. With regard to morphosyntax, it will be noted that the paradigm of eškáh is skewed in a particularly interesting way: the three ostensible defects in its morphologic array (no ettafal, no afel ppar., qal only ppar.) are in complementary distribution with respect to the syntactic oppositions. Thus syntactically the qal ppar. šəxíh ~ eškíh functions as the missing afel ppar.,¹ and then the entire afel has as its syntactic passive not the formally expected ettafal, but rather the ethpeel.² Viewed compositely, these two complementations factor to one, and what emerges is a syntactically non-defective paradigm involving

changes have been omitted and to that degree the starred forms of Table 4 are anachronistic; e.g. the assimilation stated as *e > a was probably *i > a since the assimilatory lowering to a almost certainly preceded the prosodically conditioned lowering *i > e (cf. Malone, 1971:§ §2.2.6 and 2.2.8).

¹A likely residuum of the afel ppar. is meškəhá '(it is) possible'. Though meškəhá could formally just as well be interpreted as apar., the ppar. hypothesis is more likely since (i) though Syriac also has active impersonals (Nöldeke 1904:§254), the required semantic development seems in this case strained except on the basis of the kind of impersonal judged by Brockelmann (1961:II, §67d) as "dem Aram. . . . fremd"; (ii) the homorizous šəxíh ~ eškíh is synonymously used (Payne Smith 1903: s.v. ⟨škāh⟩), and is clearly passive in form (cf. also the synonymous qal ppar. of √msy, mašyā). Whatever the voice of meškəhá, its idiomatic specialization as a predicator of possibility minimizes its pertinence to the issue at hand.

²Cognates to šəxíh ~ eškíh seem to be limited to the remaining two EAram. languages (Mand. ⟨(a)ških⟩, Bab. Talm. ⟨škyh⟩), while the afel:ethpeel skewage is present in most Aram. languages whose verb 'to find' is build on the root *√šk (note at least the following: from the

only one opposition, simple:passive. Morphologically, the simple forms ('to find') are those of the afel plus the qal ppar., while the passive forms ('to be found') are those of the ethpeel. The question as to whether this simple:passive system is syntactically primary or causative is readily resolvable in favor of the primary interpretation on the basis of a number of interlocking considerations, the most straightforward of which being that eškāh lacks a systematic counterpart 'to X' in relation to which eškāh should function as 'to cause to X'. Hence syntactically eškāh is reinterpretable as qal, rather than eštəxāh being reinterpreted as ettafal.¹

5. The discussion of §4 defended the syntactic metanalysis of Syriac eškāh to a qal verb synchronically, but the full linguistic cogency of this metanalysis depends upon its concert with the verb's morphophonologic structure. If this structure had remained unambiguously afel, as in some other Aramaic languages with a similar morphosyntactic skewage (cf. page 6, note 2), the arguments for metanalysis would at best be inconclusive. In Syriac, however, the three phonetic changes leading to the morphophonologic properties of eškāh discussed in §3 convergently effected a reshaping of this verb which not only obscured its historical status as an afel in all five relevant subparadigms (by attenuation, replacing the causative prefix a with the unique morph e) but, crucially, at the same time led to formal identification as a qal in three of these five subparadigms (impf., impa., pf.); cf. Table 5.

Table 5

	metanalyzed qal	qal model
impf.	neškāh	3/H (Table 2)
impa.	} eškāh	3/H (Table 2), prothetic forms (Table 3)
pf.		
ppar.	šəxīh ~ eškīh	strong ~ prothetic forms
apar.	meškāh	none
inf.	meškāhū	none

Imperial period [approx. 2nd half of 1st millenium B.C.], Bib. and Egyptian Aram [the 3rd century B.C. Erech cuneiform tablet contains only one form, a clear afel impa. ⟨āš-ka-ḥi-i⟩; Gordon 1938]; from what might be called the Classical period [approx. 1st millenium A.D.], all EAram. [above] and, of WAram., J. and C. Pal. [Samaritan seems to have a symmetrical afel:ettafal, but the root may not be a reflex of *škh; cf. Ben-Hayyim apud Rosenthal 1967:II/s, p. 12 s.v. šqh]; in the Modern period, only Ma'lula Aram. seems to continue a reflex of *škh, but with a morphology so mutated from earlier languages as to render its synchronic status quite problematic [Spitaler 1966:§152]). Tantalizingly, there seems to be no evidence of *škh in the Old period (1st part of 1st millenium B.C.). Another aspect of the comparative spectrum will be briefly considered on page 9, note 1.

¹The reinterpretation defended can be understood formally in terms of markedness theory, whereby ceteris paribus neutralization of an unmarked:marked opposition (here primary:causative resp.) entails the emergence of the unmarked member (here primary). For a classical formulation of this principle, cf. Trubetzkoy (1958:73 [case 3a]); for current word in markedness theory, cf. Greenberg (1966).

These observations incidentally provide the answer of this paper to the problem posed in §1: the missing condition for attenuation in *eškāh* alone of afel verbs is that this verb was syntactically not afel but qal, and consequently the effect of attenuation dampened the synchronically inappropriate marking as afel and simultaneously enhanced the synchronically appropriate marking as qal.¹ The proposed metanalysis of *eškāh* as qal receives strong independent support from the later formation of a new true causative, *aškāh* 'to cause to find'.² The historical stratification of this new paradigm is portrayed in Table 6.

Table 6

metanalyzed	new
qal	afel
(Stratum 2)	(Stratum 3)
original	
ethpeel	
(Stratum 1)	

6. Though the main goal of this paper has been to explain the seeming exceptionality of attenuation in *eškāh*, it will have been implicitly clear throughout the discussion that this one change cannot be attributed any absolute primacy in the development. For in addition to the pretonic *a* and the skewed morphosyntactic distribution discussed in §4, at least three other morphophonologic circumstances contributed to the development. In approximate descending order of importance they are: (i) The first two radicals *šk* meet the optimal conditions for prothesis (sibilant + stop), and have the support of the high-frequency prothetic verb *eštī*. If there had been no prothetic model verb, and/or if the first two radicals of **aškēh* had not been sibilant + stop, attenuated *impa./pf.* *eškāh* could hardly have been metanalyzed as qal. (ii) If **aškēh* had not had a 3/H and in consequence the assimilation **e > a* (or **i > a*; page 5, note 4) had not taken place, the resulting *impf.* *šneškēh* and *impa./pf.* *šeškēh* would evidence a 2nd shematic ablaut (*impf./impa. e: pf. e*) unique for the qal, either dynamic or neuter (cf. Table 1 for the typical oppositions *o:a* and *a:e*).³ (iii) As discussed in §1, the fact that *aškēh* has a 1/š may well have acted as a phonetic catalyst for attenuation in the first place.⁴

¹The somewhat different development tersely proposed by Schulthess (1965:28) for C. Pal. Aramaic (cf. page 9, note 1 below) founders on the comparative evidence presented above on page 6, note 2 to the effect that the ethpeel of **škh* seems clearly to date from Common Aramaic. In any event, the conditions he suggests for the development of the C. Pal ethpeel were clearly not present in Bib. Aram., which equally clearly had an ethpeel (hithpeel).

²Nöldeke (1904:132). The question as to whether the new qal paradigm should be understood as dynamic or neuter (cf. page 3, note 1 and page 4, note 2) is likely to be meaningless, but note that (i) in terms of the discussion of page 3, note 1, 'finding' is more of a neuter than a dynamic concept (as opposed to the specific actions implementing or implemented by the 'finding' per se); and (ii) in the way of typological support, one of the commonest Classical Arabic verbs for 'find' is the neuter-marked *laqiya*.

³Cf. Nöldeke (1904:105f) for a brief survey of rarer ablaut alternations.

⁴It is possible that even more factors were involved; e.g. the support of the verbal noun *šəhāxā*, built on a measure (1ə2ā3) particularly common in derivatives from qal verbs (Nöldeke 1904: §109).

If the complex of hypotheses set forth above is largely accurate, the development of Syriac eškāḥ constitutes an Aramaic case history of convergent factors in linguistic change.¹

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bauer, H. und P. Leander. 1962a [orig. 1922]. Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments. Hildesheim.
- _____. 1962b [orig. 1927]. Grammatik des Biblisch-Syrischen. Hildesheim.
- Bergsträsser, G. 1962 [orig. 1918 and 1929]. Hebräische Grammatik, I and II. Hildesheim.
- Brockelmann, C. 1961 [orig. 1908 and 1913]. Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen, I and II. Hildesheim.
- _____. 1965. Syrische Grammatik. Leipzig.
- Dalman, G. 1960 [orig. 1905]. Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch. Darmstadt.
- Drower, E. S. and R. Macuch. 1963. A Mandaic Dictionary. Oxford.
- Duval, R. 1881. Traité de Grammaire Syriaque. Paris.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1968. "The Case for Case," in Universals in Linguistic Theory, ed. E. Bach and R. T. Harms. New York. Pp. 1-88.
- Gordon, C. H. 1938. "The Aramaic Incantation in Cuneiform," AfO 12.105-117.
- Greenberg, J. H. 1966. "Language Universals," in Current Trends in Linguistics, III, ed. T. A. Sebeok. The Hague. Pp. 61-112.
- Jastrow, M. 1950. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. New York.
- Malkiel, Y. 1969. "The Five Sources of Epenthetic /j/ in Western Hispano-Romance: A Study in Multiple Causation," Hispanic Review 37:2.239-275.
- Malone, J. L. 1972 "A Hebrew Flip-Flop Rule and Its Historical Origins," Lingua 30:4.422-448.
- _____. 1970. "Two Hypotheses on the Origin of an Aramaic Apocope-Paragoge Process," Glossa 4:2.206-211.
- _____. 1971. "Systematic Metathesis in Mandaic," Language 47:2.394-415.

¹Whatever engendered the hunch that gave rise to the specific hypotheses set forth in this paper, I feel an ultimate debt to Yakov Malkiel's splendid work in the area of multiple causation in diachrony; cf. e.g. Malkiel (1969). An interesting question for future research is the dialectological scope of the metanalysis of */škh/. While Syriac seems to be the only Aramaic language to have carried the process so far, several other dialects with a similar morpho-syntactic skewage (cf. page 6, note 2) show what may be inchoative evidence of the process in the form of sporadic attenuation: e.g. J. Pal. (in terms of Dalman's classification [1960:6-43], from all three types, "Judean," "Galilean," and "Mixed," e.g. resp. niškāḥ, ⟨nyškḥ⟩ [both ibid.: 274, more exx. 370, 372], and miškāḥ [Jastrow 1950: s.v. ⟨škḥ⟩ II]); C. Pal. (⟨?škḥ, yškḥ⟩ in Schulthess 1903:s.v. ⟨škḥ⟩ [cf. page 8, note 1 above]); and even the Babylonian variant form hiškāḥ in Bib. Aram. (Bauer and Leander 1962:§41v).

- Margolis, M.L. 1910 Lehrbuch der Aramäischen Sprache des Babylonischen Talmuds. München.
- Moscatti, S., A. Spitaler, E. Ullendorff and W. von Soden. 1964. An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. Wiesbaden.
- Nöldeke, T. 1904. Compendious Syriac Grammar, trans. J.A. Crichton. London.
- Payne Smith, J. 1903. A Compendious Syriac Dictionary. Oxford.
- Rosenthal, F.(ed.). 1967. An Aramaic Handbook, I and II. Wiesbaden.
- Schulthess, F. 1903. Lexicon Syropalaestinum. Berlin.
- _____. 1965 [orig. 1924]. Grammatik des Christlich-Palästinischen Aramäisch. Hildesheim.
- Spitaler, A. 1966 [orig. 1938]. Grammatik des Neuaramäischen Dialekts von Ma'lūla (Antilibanon). Nendeln.
- Trubetzkoy, N.S. 1958. Grundzüge der Phonologie. Göttingen.
- Wright, W. 1967 [orig. 1896]. A Grammar of the Arabic Language, I. Cambridge.

AAL 1/1 (1974) 38 pp.

Paul Newman and Russell G. Schuh
The Hausa Aspect System

In this paper the authors hope to account for the aspect marking constructions of modern Hausa by providing detailed historical explanations of their origin and development, beginning with morphological forms and syntactic patterns reconstructed for Proto-Hausa. The description accounts for the asymmetry in certain paradigms, the lack of parallelism between affirmative and negative paradigms in certain aspects, and some of the differences between contemporary dialects. The hypotheses about Hausa history are supported by reliable comparative data from other Chadic languages.

AAL 1/3 (1974) approx. 25 pp.

Robert Hetzron
Extrinsic Ordering in Classical Arabic

One speaks of extrinsic ordering when the order of application of two rules must be specifically indicated and does not follow from a general principle. In Arabic the survival of a long vowel in a syllable made closed by a contraction may be a case of such ordering, though it may also be interpreted as an intrinsically order sequel of 'nonproductive—operative' rules. On the other hand, the incongruent agreement of numerals with the underlying singulars of the cooccurring plural nouns is definitely extrinsically ordered.

Also available as a part of MJNE:

ASSUR

Editors: Karl-Heinz Deller, Paul Garelli, Claudio Saporetti

ASSUR is meant to serve the needs of the specialized field which is closely identified with the study of Assyrian as a dialect of Akkadian and with the history of Assyria as a special aspect of Mesopotamian civilization, from early times down to the end of the Assyrian empire. Given the intensity of linguistic and historical exchanges with neighboring regions, it is clear that the study of Assyrian dialect and history cannot be carried on in isolation, without due consideration to influences deriving from contacts with other people. Hence, ASSUR will also accept articles which are not exclusively Assyrian in scope, as long as they are related to Assyria and useful for the study of its language and history.

MJNE has as its aim not only to introduce a new outlet for scholarly communication in the field of the Near East, but also to provide a new formula for a more effective and rapid dissemination of research results. Two problems are generally recognized in this connection:

(a) There is often a considerable backlog of articles awaiting publication, causing considerable delays between submission and publication.

(b) Journals are not always sufficiently specialized, so that scholars find little use in subscribing personally when only a few articles will be of direct interest to them.

In an attempt to obviate this situation, MJNE has been designed to provide maximum flexibility of production and distribution as described below.

DISTRIBUTION

1. MJNE is a system of journals. Each journal is highly specialized and fully independent editorially. The purpose and scope of the various journals is determined in each case by the respective editor(s).
2. The only link among the journals of the system, apart from the common geographical focus on the Near East, is of a practical nature; subscribers have a subscription option on any journal of the system, as described below in the purchasing schedule.
3. Each issue, or fascicle, consists of a single article, of uneven length (identical in principle to an offprint as currently available through the trade). Very short articles (less than about 6 pages) are held and either added to another article of a cognate nature, or collected in occasional miscellaneous fascicles. Even in such cases, however, every effort is made to secure a speedy publication.
4. Every article is printed as soon as accepted, normally within the span of two months, including the reading of the proofs.
5. A volume consists of an indeterminate number of issues for any given journal. It will be closed as a volume when a total of about 250 pages is reached, without volumes necessarily corresponding to calendar years.
6. A list of abstracts is published three times a year for the entire system; it contains the titles and short summaries for all the issues published within the system.
7. Book reviews appear together in separate fascicles; they may be either full size review articles, or combined notices of various publications—all of them closely linked to the sphere of interest peculiar to the individual journal. These issues thus serve to provide periodical assessments of the state of the various disciplines.

PURCHASING SCHEDULE.

1. Each subscription is \$10 for 200 pages, postpaid (5¢ per page; 10¢ per photographic plate). Thus the subscriber pays not per volume or year, but only for a number of pages which he chooses as he wishes, according to two basic options.
2. (a) One may use the list of abstracts to make periodical selections drawing on the initial purchase price.

(b) In addition, the subscriber may also reserve one or more journals; he then receives all issues of the journal as they are published, with the option of returning any unwanted issue within two weeks (in which case subscriber pays postage and handling both ways).
3. Individual issues without subscription may be purchased at the cost of 7¢ per page and 20¢ per plate, plus postage.

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS

1. All textual material should be transcribed in Latin characters, without limitations on the transcription system to be used (unless otherwise specified by the individual journal editors).
2. Footnotes are to be typed on separate pages with running numeration (in the publication they are inserted at the bottom of the page).
3. A division into sections and a table of contents is desirable for longer articles.
4. Authors receive 5 reprints free; 25 additional reprints may be purchased at the same rate as per subscription.

Correspondence concerning the scholarly content of the Journals, as well as the sending of the articles and books for review, should be addressed directly to the editor of each Journal.

Correspondence concerning subscriptions and other practical matters should be addressed to the publisher:

Undena Publications, POB 97, Malibu, California, 90265

Afroasiatic Linguistics (AAL) invites contributions in linguistics falling within the vast domain of Afroasiatic (Hamito-Semitic) languages. Articles of general, theoretical interest using Afroasiatic material, descriptive, historical and comparative studies are all welcome.